

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 7 and 8 have been cancelled. In addition, claims 1-6 have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 2, as being indefinite, and then invokes paragraph 6, stating, each of these "means for" statements must have a specific physical structure in the specification.

35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 6 states:

"An element in a claim for a combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof, and such claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof."

Applicants believe that claim 4 as amended, as well as claim 6 as amended, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, in that each of the means + function elements is supported in the specification.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,140,045 to Gudorf et al.

The Gudorf et al. patent discloses a method and system for user information verification, in which a computer program, in the form of, for example, a Java applet, collects and stores information (which may include parental controls) identifying a

user, then selectively supplies this information to other programs (websites) requesting the same.

The subject invention relates to an information carrier having a preset parental control level and an information carrier player having a current parental control level. The player then compares the current parental control level with the preset parental control level and, depending on the comparison, authorizes or denies access to the information on the information carrier. In addition, the subject invention associates various server addresses with parental control levels and restricts user access to those server addresses having associated parental control levels less than or equal to the current parental control level of the information carrier player.

As noted in MPEP § 2131, it is well-founded that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In the Office Action, the Examiner states "Claim 1 discloses a method of controlling, from an information carrier player (101), a user access to an information carrier (105) and to a server (103), said information carrier (105) being associated

with a preset parental control level (DVD\_PCL), said information carrier player (101) being associated with a current parental control level (Current\_PCL\_i) selected from among a set of parental control levels (PCL\_I), said method of controlling comprising (Figure 2 and associated text and Figure 3a and 3b)“.

Applicants first would like to point out that Gudorf et al. neither discloses nor suggests “controlling, from an information carrier player, user access to information on an information carrier loaded in the information carrier player”. Further, Gudorf et al. neither discloses nor suggests “said information carrier being associated with a preset parental control level”. In fact, there is no mention in Gudorf et al. of an information carrier having a preset parental control level, the controlling of access to the information on the information carrier loaded into the information carrier player. Rather, Gudorf et al. is only concerned with controlling access to certain websites.

Applicants would like to point out that in the subject application and claims, the “preset parental control level” relates only to the information carrier, while the “current parent control level” relates only to the information carrier player.

Applicants therefore submit that since Gudorf et al. neither discloses nor suggests “said information carrier being associated with a preset parental control level”, then surely Gudorf et al. neither discloses nor suggests the steps “receiving the preset parental control level associated with said information carrier”, “comparing said current parental control level and said

preset parental control level", and "authorizing or not authorizing access to the information on said information carrier in dependence on said comparing step".

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-8, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/  
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611